

## Panel Discussion “THE GRAND CHESSBOARD” TODAY AND TOMORROW

---

June 9, 2022.

A. P. Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

### SPEAKERS:

- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY *President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation (moderator)*
- I. O. ABRAMOVA *Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS (Moscow), member of the Presidium of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor*
- V. A. CHERESHNEV *Chief Researcher of the Institute of Immunology and Physiology of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Ekaterinburg), member of the Presidium of the Ural Branch of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Medicine), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*
- E. G. DRAPEKO *First Deputy Chairman of the State Duma Committee on Culture of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Honored Artist of the Russian Federation*
- S. Yu. GLAZYEV *Minister for Integration and Macroeconomics of the Eurasian Economic Commission (Moscow), Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor*
- Al. A. GROMYKO *Director of the Institute of Europe of the RAS (Moscow), corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor of the RAS*
- A. K. ISAEV *Deputy Head of the “United Russia” party faction in the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Political Sciences, Professor of SPbUHSS*
- S. I. KISLYAK *First Deputy Chairman of the Committee of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on International Affairs (Moscow), Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to the USA (2008–2017)*
- D. A. LIKHANOV *Writer, Chairman of the Russian Children’s Fund (Moscow), Children’s Protection Fund, President of the International Association of Children’s Funds*
- A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV *Chief Researcher of the Institute of State and Law of the RAS (Moscow), Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor*
- V. L. MAKAROV *Scientific Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the RAS, Director of the Higher School of Public Administration of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor*
- V. K. MAMONTOV *Chairman of the board of directors of the newspaper “Komsomolskaya Pravda” (Moscow), Director General of the radio station “Govorit Moskva”, director of the Foundation for the Support of Network Initiatives “Smart Internet”*
- S. G. MUSIENKO *Director of the Analytical Center “EsooM” (Minsk), Member of the Public Advisory Council under the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Belarus*
- V. V. NAUMKIN *Scientific supervisor of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the RAS (Moscow), Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor*
- R. I. NIGMATULIN *Scientific supervisor at P. P. Shirshov Institute of Oceanology of the RAS (Moscow), member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor*
- V. G. PETUKHOV *Professor of the Department of Theory of Law and Law Enforcement of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Candidate of Law, Judge of the Statutory Court of St. Petersburg (2005–2011), Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Honorary Employee of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Lieutenant General of militia in reserve*
- V. N. PUNCHENKO *Deputy Director of the Belarusian Institute for Strategic Studies (Minsk)*

- M. V. SHMAKOV *Member of the State Council of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS*
- Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO *Chief Researcher at the Institute of Sociology of the Federal Research Sociological Center of the RAS (Moscow), corresponding member of the RAS, Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the RAS journal "Sociological Studies", Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor*
- M. V. ZAKHAROVA *Director of the Information and Press Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary*
- K. F. ZATULIN *First Deputy Chairman of the State Duma Committee of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on CIS Affairs, Eurasian Integration and Relations with Compatriots (Moscow), Deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Director of the Institute of CIS Countries*

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Before we begin the second part of the discussion (which I think is very interesting, and I hope you will appreciate it), I would like to ask Andrey Konstantinovich Isaev, a professor at our university, one of the most famous members of the Russian State Duma, deputy head of the United Russia faction, to say a few words.

**A. K. ISAEV:** – Dear friends, I'll keep it short. I would like to read a special greeting from the Chairman of the State Duma, Vyacheslav Viktorovich Volodin:

"Dear friends, the Likhachov Conference is a reputed academic forum where scientists, politicians, public figures, representatives of culture and arts discuss relevant issues and key trends of development of the modern world, the problems that concern people in our country and abroad. You will have thematic discussions about traditional values and a 'new ethics' of the West, a transition from unipolarity to the model of a multipolar world, the state of the global economy and the objectives of the Russian education. These issues are essential. I wish you interesting, fruitful work and all the best. Sincerely, Vyacheslav Viktorovich Volodin."

For myself, with your permission, I will speak during the panel discussion. Thank you.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I would like to invite to the stage a delegation of scientists, our friends from Belarus, headed by Deputy Minister of Information Igor Ivanovich Buzovsky. They asked for a small gift-giving ceremony. Our guests decided that 600 volumes in the University library was not enough and that we needed more. Of course, I couldn't disagree: who would refuse books for the library?

**V. N. PUNCHENKO:** – We give you the books published by the Union of Writers of Belarus (I am a member of the board of this organization). Among them is a whole series of publications signed for the University by the Belarusian writer Nikolai Ivanovich Cherginets, whose books have a circulation of 7.5 million copies. In addition, we present a valuable engraving and a commemorative address from the Belarusian State Academy of Art. In connection with the fact that your anniversary is coming, I have a proposal: if you allow, we can land in Belarus a joint crea-

tive scientific and cultural landing party. We also give you a selection of periodicals. Our country has a newspaper called "Nastaunitskaya Gazeta" (translated into Russian as "Teacher's Newspaper"). The same holding also publishes sports and scientific magazines. I suggest that some of the papers from the 5th section of the Likhachov Conference are included in these publications in order to cover the work of the event.

**S. G. MUSIENKO:** – To support the invitation to Belarus made by Igor Ivanovich, I present a prototype of the invitation letter – an oil painting depicting the historical center of Minsk. I also take the opportunity to present you a project prepared by the Belarusian Institute for Strategic Studies – "Value portrait of modern Belarusian society." It is the quintessence of our values: we will build our future on them.

**I. I. BUZOVSKY:** – Aleksandr Sergeyevich, I would like to present you with a calendar based on a unique private collection of photographs of Belarus. If you download the app and point your phone at a photo, it will come to life. How does it work? From the point where the picture was taken, you will be able to see how this place looks today. The calendar is eternal and symbolically called "Bat-kivshchyna."

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you very much. Friends, these gifts are especially dear to me, because I know: the people standing on the stage now have very recently done a lot to stabilize the extremely difficult situation in Belarus. They pulled it off brilliantly. We thank them for this.

Dear friends, we are starting the discussion. I invite Sergey Yurievich Glazyev, Konstantin Fedorovich Zatulín, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Maria Vladimirovna Zakharova, Andrey Konstantinovich Isaev, Sergey Ivanovich Kislyak to come to the stage. I also invite Vitaly Vyacheslavovich Naumkin. I haven't introduced him yet. This is an eminent scientist, an academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, scientific director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. I think next to no one in our country knows more about the Eastern world than he does. Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov also joins us.

So, I invited colleagues to discuss the transition from unipolarity to real multipolarity and the problems of the new geopolitics. For me, this topic breaks down into two questions, and I would like to clarify my colleagues' opinions on each of them. First, I ask the speakers to briefly describe the situation in the present-day Russia. Second, to express your views on the immediate prospects of the state of affairs in the world community. As the title of today's discussion, perhaps I would take Zbigniew Brzezinski's "The Grand Chessboard," not as a joke or parody, but as a reminder. In this essay, Brzezinski justified a simple idea: Russia with Ukraine is a great empire; Russia without Ukraine is a regional power. The book was written quite a long time ago, but it helps us understand what principles are ingrained in American politics and how today, many years after the publication, many things discussed in it come true.

To kick-off the discussion, I would like to present what I believe is a collective point of view that has been elaborated here at the Likhachov Conference. The fact is that there is a person among us who reads every single report of the Conference. It's me. During my life I have read more than 4,000 reports of the International Likhachov Conference. Over the last 15 years (about the same time a similar process was going on in the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs), the idea that the world community was moving towards an era of the end of unipolarity was taking shape at the Likhachov Conference. Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin spoke about this in Munich quite independently of us; the same conclusions were reached by the participants of the Conference. Moreover, the greatest philosopher of our time, and perhaps of the entire history of the world philosophy, our Honorary Doctor, Academician Vyacheslav Semenovitch Stepin, noted that the modern model of the Western civilization was in crisis. There was no globalization in the world; it was, in fact, Westernization – imposition of the Western model of life. Stepin observed that this model was in the deepest crisis, and very insightfully substantiated his observation in a series of papers at the Conference. Then we collectively looked into the causes of this crisis.

There are several main causes. First, the crisis in the United States: it is the most developed capitalist country, and if a certain socio-economic order comes to decline, it happens first to the leading country, and only then the process covers the rest. The example of the United States shows very clearly how a whole series of drivers of capitalism have ceased to work. The first of these drivers is competition. Competition in the form of Karl Marx's time no longer exists: it has been replaced by state monopolistic capitalism. Powerful monopolies, transnational corporations and the like suppress competition and deprive capitalism of this driver in its modern, most developed form. Also, such a powerful driver as freedom of speech is disappearing, because the entire press is being bought up by big capital. A few years ago, the proceedings of Likhachov Conference published a brilliant work by the Canadian professor of Polish origin, a very major scholar Piotr Dutkiewicz, which, as far as I remember, was titled "Market, Modernization, and Democracy. Reflections on Inter-Civilization Relations" Democracy is a very powerful driver of capitalism. When it is privatized, it ceases to work, being replaced by a money-bag contest: the one who gives the lar-

gest bribes and gets promoted by the corrupt press, wins the election.

Finally, the main driver is the national elite. Academician Oleg Timofeyevich Bogomolov and I have conducted a set of studies regarding the processes that took place in China, the USSR and other similar socio-economic formations. If the direction of the country's development is well chosen, then the system works productively for many years. Then faults start to occur, and at this point the national elite must have its say. If it is able to come up with ideas that will get the system out of a difficult situation, then a new round of development begins – this is what happened in China. If the national elite is unable to offer such an idea, the system will move toward disintegration, which may happen even to great empires.

From 1980s to 1990s, the elite of the Soviet Union failed to develop a new ideology, so it was decided to use the ideology of the West. However, we have done much worse than even the lagging Western countries, especially in the economy. China and Russia are not even comparable.

Nevertheless, the Western system has failed to work out a way to reform capitalism, which became evident with the arrival of Donald Trump. A number of personal qualities prevented him from being a good president, but he had an eye for the problems. If America had given him a chance to fix things and officials along with the national elite had done their duty, the U.S. would probably have had a great chance to prosper. Now that the U.S. has essentially returned to the state under Barack Obama, the chances of such an outcome have greatly diminished. My personal point of view is as follows: America is moving very quickly toward becoming a regional power. Putin started the special operation on time. Generally, in Russia things are not as good as they could be, but in the West they are downright bad. The events happening today could lead to a major reformatting of the world order.

Speaking at the Likhachov Conference three years ago, Academician Glazyev said that the Americans have very few serious trump cards left. The first is the Bretton Woods monetary system, which Russia, China and other countries are now destroying. By the way, the U.S. national debt is about \$32 trillion. It is an indicator of the disaster that is happening to the country's economy. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to get out of such a situation. The second trump card mentioned by Academician Glazyev is world leadership in the development of electronic technologies, particularly in the field of mass communication. China has solved this problem for itself, we are advancing towards the solution slowly, even sluggishly, but I think the time is approaching for countries to transition to nationally-oriented information systems. So, the two systems that give Americans an advantage – currency and information – will be destroyed. What will they have left? Military bases around the world, on which the U.S. officially spends about \$700 billion a year, and unofficially about a trillion. Soon such expenses will be beyond their means. So, again, we should expect reformatting of the world order.

Colleagues, you have an opportunity to share your opinions. I threw in some balls, now it's your turn. Sergey Yurievich, shall we start with you?

**S. Yu. GLAZYEV:** – First of all, I want to continue my previous thought by reminding you that this transforma-

tion inevitably leads to the collapse of the core of the outgoing world economy, and the signs of the collapse of the American system in financial, political and other areas, as listed by Aleksandr Sergeyevich, are classic signs of the collapse of what remains. I would say that the old world economic order had two cores – the USSR and the United States. From the governance point of view, they were very similar, but radically different in terms of ideology. We have been in transition for 30 years, and a unipolar world is specific to this transition. The ruling elite of the only remaining core is trying to preserve its hegemony by starting a world war, as I mentioned earlier today.

Aleksandr Sergeyevich is absolutely right that the situation is heading toward the collapse of the American system. First, the ideological contour collapses – we can judge this by the collapse of the ideas of democracy in the United States and rigging of the recent elections there. The U.S. is no longer an example for the rest of the world. Further, the legal circuit is crumbling, as evidenced by systemic violations of international law on the part of none other than the United States. Then the money circuit collapses. In the war against us, the Americans in the Russophobic fervor played their main trump card – a monopoly on the issue of world currency. The dollar has lost that status, no one believes in it anymore, and there are hardly any fools who will continue to build up foreign exchange reserves in dollars. As for the production circuit, America has already lost to China in this area. This leaves the last vestige of social self-organization – the family circuit. However, it is ruined as well because of LGBT propaganda.

Thus, the U.S. is in a state of systemic disintegration. However, this country poses a great danger. Aleksandr Sergeyevich mentioned Brzezinski. His judgment that Russia without Ukraine would not be an empire is unscientific and archaic. But these kinds of ideas have poisoned Western public consciousness, and it has taken on a distinctly Russophobic direction.

Thus, we once again found ourselves in the midst of a world war. Obviously, China will win this war, as I have already said, and the future of the world economy will be shaped in a bipolar world – in competition between communist China and democratic India. The world development in this century will depend on these two countries, just as it did on the USSR and the United States in the last century. The other countries will begin, one way or another, to join with one of these cores. The new system will be based on three components. The first is socialist ideology, that is, the primacy of public interests over personal, private ones, characteristic of India and China, and of Asia as a whole. The second is market competition, which ensures the efficiency of the economy. The third is the primacy of national interests. Unlike in Soviet socialism, in the ideology of the new leaders, national interests will be more important than international solidarity of workers. This fusion of the three components will form the basis of the coming world economic order.

As for our country, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, it found itself on the periphery of the outgoing world order. We blindly believed in a unipolar system, which in fact was no more than an instant in the process of change in the world economy. What do I mean by peripheral position? We have actually become donors who, before the current events, were sending billions of tons of raw materials

to the West. There was a drain of capital and minds. We now run the risk of finding ourselves on the periphery of both the old global economic order that is receding and the new one that is forming in Asia, to which Russia also supplies raw materials. In order to get out of this, I would say, unpromising situation, we need to consolidate the society, mobilize reserves, and create our own governance system with a traditional Russian ideology and reliance on national interests. Scientists of the Academy of Sciences came to the conclusion that Russia can reach the trajectory of economic growth of not less than 8% per year provided that it establishes a governance system similar to those of countries with the new world economic order.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Konstantin Fedorovich, please, you have the floor.

**K. F. ZATULIN:** – I want to get away from the general discussion to a more specific topic, which I have already touched upon today. Vyacheslav Alekseevich Nikonov, my colleague in the State Duma and formerly on the Komsomol Committee of the Faculty of History at Lomonosov Moscow State University, host of Big Game, in every program repeats the words of his grandfather V. M. Molotov: “Our cause is just, victory will be ours.”

I have no doubt that our cause is just. The question is different: what exactly is considered a victory, and when and how can it be achieved? Some, tired of their own underachievement, would declare anything a victory as long as the conflict comes to a quicker end. I am not in favor of this approach. It is now clear that the situation has gone beyond the goals of recognizing the Donetsk and Lugansk People’s Republics or, say, securing Crimea for Russia, because we already control the population centers outside of these territories. Besides, it is clear that the official Ukraine, which is influenced by Western countries, is not ready to agree to anything today.

When the president of Ukraine speaks at events, the audience stands up because this is the fashion, this is the demand of the Western world. He basks in the glory, and apparently, unlike nationally oriented statesmen, he does not care how many Ukrainian soldiers are dying at the moment. His order is to harm Russia.

The other day in London, Estonian Prime Minister Kaja Kallas received an award for opposing Russia and supporting Western efforts. The Estonian and British prime ministers echoed each other, urging not to make peace with Russia under any circumstances and to continue to fight, as we say, to the last Ukrainian. Looking at things like that, I think that after a certain time (I can’t predict exactly how long), we will see the frozen confrontation turn into an active one.

I do not agree with those who believe that we are capable of fighting many adversaries at once and that the Western economy has exhausted its resources. In particular, it surprises me that Vyacheslav Nikonov says over and over again that our economy is grandiose and that the Western economy is nothing, a crumpled piece of paper, an empty wrap. I don’t think so. The West certainly fell into the Thucydides trap when it took advantage of our confrontation with Ukraine to launch a preemptive strike against Russia as a potential ally of China. But in the process of this operation, I think it moved on to a bigger idea. Germany,

France, Japan, and Australia have all fallen into line and are playing by the rules that Washington dictates. They decided that they were in a position to inflict injuries on Russia that would be incompatible with life as a state. As long as the West does not give up on this idea, we can really speak of the domestic war of survival. We have to understand: it is costly for us, but at the same time we have absolutely no alternative. It's not that the West doesn't like President Putin – it doesn't like all of us and our state.

In between discussions I was able to attend the opening of the International Peter the Great Congress at the Hermitage Theater. At the congress, they said that Peter the Great's highest achievement and his dearest love was the city of St. Petersburg. I do not want to argue with this point of view, but I still think that the main creation of Peter the Great is not St. Petersburg, but the Russian Empire. I am very sorry that last year we celebrated the 300th anniversary of the proclamation of Russia as an empire with so little enthusiasm. Fortunately, this year there is a major celebration of the 350th anniversary of the first emperor.

In conclusion, I would like to say that dealing with today's problems will take a long time. There is an opinion that the unipolar world was unstable, while the multipolar world that will replace it will, on the contrary, be stable. In fact, a multipolar world can be much more unstable than a unipolar world. We have entered this period, and we have no alternatives, because things will never be the same.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – You are welcome, Maria Vladimirovna.

**M. V. ZAKHAROVA:** – I would like to draw on Konstantin Fedorovich's words about the prize that the British authorities gave to the Estonian Prime Minister. There is a very important nuance here: what exactly was the cause of the award? Clearly, we are not interested in the official wording, but in the true meaning of the event. Why the Prime Minister of Estonia? As if Estonia were the main interest of British politics. Of course, that's not true. Britain has interests in the Baltics, but also in Poland and many other countries. Could it be that the British are betting on Kallas, promoting her? With all due respect to Estonia, I don't think the country has any resources that could be of such interest to London. So what is it about? Konstantin Fedorovich said that it was for the support for the efforts of the West and the Kiev regime. But the regime is supported by many, especially in the countries of the NATO-centric system.

In my opinion, the cause is the idea promoted by the Estonian Prime Minister. Notice how anti-diplomatic and just plain stupid her actions are. Kaja Kallas did not come to power on her own. Her father is a politician and her great-grandfather was a police chief. Not every eastern emirate can boast such clannishness as the small Baltic democracy, where power is in fact practically inherited.

Kaja Kallas appeared on the Western media scene with a startling idea. She called on European leaders to stop any contact with Russia. At first it just seemed like an unfortunate wording. I began to follow Kallas' remarks. She kept insisting, not only giving interviews, but also writing for the European press. And she received the award for this very idea – to block all contacts of European grandees with Russia.

The topic of confrontation between the collective West and Russia regularly appears on the international information agenda. Washington simultaneously duels with Moscow and Beijing. Even Henry Kissinger was horrified by this two-handed shooting. He noted that Washington has never confronted two centers of such power at the same time (although their power manifests itself in different ways).

However, all this lies on the surface, but what is hidden inside? I am absolutely certain that Washington's target is not Moscow or Beijing. The U.S. wants to eliminate its main competitor, the European Union. Over the past 20 years it has become a real world leader. A strong currency emerged in the structure of the EU, which rushed into the global financial arena, gaining its place by the real sector of the economy, rather than as the dollar did – by the printing press. Mr. Glazyev, as an economist, could explain this much better than I. I am not an economist, but I want to draw your attention to the fact that the euro is secured by the real economic opportunities and resources of almost thirty countries.

That's what I think is the key to what's going on right now. That is why Russian energy resources were cut off from Europe: the blow was directed at them, not at us. All we've been talking about for the last thirty years was getting off the energy monorail. By and large, the U.S. was working to the benefit of our ideology in this case.

The European Union was formed at a time when there was an acute confrontation between the two systems in the world. This association was to contribute to the non-conflict development of Europe. The European Union is the artery that feeds Europe, and if this artery is cut, the consequences will be fatal.

That's why the talk about Brexit was even funny to listen to. There was speculation as to how such a thing could have happened, and whether the British were making a mistake. There was no mistake. There was a deliberate action to disengage the country from the association, which it initially joined only on favorable terms for itself. Such fundamental things for the state as currency and rules for crossing the border were still determined by Britain on its own. It was clear to the British that the next stage of the plan after their exit from the union was to weaken the EU, to put it in its place.

The last thing I want to talk about now is Russia's role in the current events. It is now much clearer how our place and the place of any other country is seen by the collective West. Everything became clear after the failed visit of Sergey Lavrov to Serbia. The West has made it clear that it would like to see any state in such a way that even taking a plane to it would be possible only with its permission. In the ideal Western model of the world, everything is submitted to the interests of the ruling elite in Washington. Russia understands this very well, but does not agree with this state of affairs.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Andrei Konstantinovich, please.

**A. K. ISAEV:** – During these hundred days I traveled through all eight federal districts of Russia and visited Donetsk and Lugansk. I had heuristic conversations with people (I would define the genre that way) about the situation we were in and what would happen next. Almost eve-

rywhere, except in the last two places, there was always someone who asked me something like this: “When do you think all this will end and the old, normal life will resume?” Since a pioneer must be not only polite, but also honest, I could only answer one thing: “Never.” The world we are used to, the world that existed before February 24, or before the pandemic began, or before 2014, will never return. It will inevitably be different, both in the case of our victory and in the case of our defeat. Unfortunately, many of our countrymen do not understand this yet.

The war between Russia and the collective West for the redistribution of the world has begun. Unfortunately, in my opinion, it was inevitable. The economic and political order of the world entered an acute conflict. The political order is multipolar: five countries, representing five political systems, have veto power in the UN Security Council. The economic system is unipolar: the U.S. dollar and financial capital dominate. Thus, the world must either adjust politics to the economy or remake the existing economic system.

What are the objectives of our enemies in this war? In fact, there can be a variety of objectives in war: to force the enemy to retreat, to make it more accommodating, etc. But in this case it is different. You can listen and read what the traitors who fled the country have to say. They keep repeating the same thing: modern Russia is a direct heir to the Mongol-Tatar horde, the Moscow Kingdom, the Russian Empire, and the Soviet Union. It is an imperialist state by default and therefore must be destroyed. The war with us is being waged on a cultural level as well, and such a war always involves dehumanization of the enemy.

As a civilization, as a country, we face a choice: either win or perish. But what does it mean to win in a situation where we are fighting against the strongest country in the world and the strongest military and political bloc in the world – NATO? How are we going to win it? From my point of view, to win for us is to endure. If we stand up to the pressure, then the American-centric world will inevitably (here I agree with Sergey Yurievich) disintegrate. We have to hold out for a while. Does our country have the necessary resources for this? I believe it does. And the weakest link from this point of view is not economics. Such a link is ideology.

There is no coherent ideology in Russia today. Sergey Yurievich spoke of the crisis of American ideology. Yes, it may be in a crisis, but it is coherent, understandable, and can be presented in the form of simple and clear slogans and ideas for everyone. What about us? We have dealt with the past, honor traditions and build on them. The past, based on historical experience, provides an answer to the question of what we are up against. The future answers the question of what we are fighting for. For a multipolar world, we repeat. What is a multipolar world for us? There is a world where the United States dominates. Are we suggesting to create several worlds with one dominant country in each of them? It is unlikely that such an idea would gain support, and that we would find many allies. Or is a multipolar world something different for us? For example, the shift from a system where financial capital dominates production to a system where capital acts as a subordinate. That’s what needs to be thought out and discussed. In order to endure and win, we must build a common national ideology that everyone in the country will share.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Sergey Ivanovich, please.

**S. I. KISLYAK:** – I agree with most of the opinions expressed by my colleagues, but I would like to argue a little with Andrey Konstantinovich. Why I don’t think this is a global conflict? Undoubtedly, there is a fateful struggle for our interests, deciding our future in the world. But the Americans are trying to make this conflict global – primarily to draw a new dividing line in the world, so that those on the other side of the line, on the side of the so-called advanced democracy, would unite against Russia.

The division of the world into democracies and autocracies is a new ideological fracture that the West is trying to impose on us in order to make it easier to explain the economic pressure and its hostility towards Russia. But let’s look at the world map: the vast majority of countries are unwilling to impose any sanctions against Russia, despite the massive machinations and even threats from the United States. This is very important to us. However, we must bear in mind that their behavior is not due to their special disposition toward us, but to the fact that the duplicity of the West is reflected in the lives of these countries, both in the present day and in the future. They believe that in such a situation, it is better not to follow the orders of the great powers of the world, but to remain independent and make their own decisions.

That’s why I think the current conflict is extremely complicated and requires maximum mobilization of our forces. What can be done? Sergey Yurievich gave the answer: to develop the economy. We have a beautiful country – with enormous reserves of natural resources and very talented people. All that is required is to organize rational use of this wealth. But we must stop looking up to Western countries and buying from them whatever they are willing to sell. We have to think several steps ahead. This is important because the West seeks to consolidate its dominant position in the economy by imposing its standards in industry. They have especially advanced in this strategy during the Obama presidency. The stake was placed on the development of new industries and manufactures. The U.S. planned to implement its own standards, then to take and strengthen its position where it had not yet done so, and to gain new opportunities to advance its interests in the field of economics.

Yes, the U.S. is going through a lot of difficulties right now, primarily in the domestic politics. The country is split over almost all issues except one: attitude toward Russia. There is a nationwide competition to see who can come up with the best proposal to damage the Russian economy. We cannot take it lightly, because we have a serious fight ahead of us, and in any fight you need to understand your opponent. Thirty-two trillion dollars is not the entire debt yet. To this one needs to add social obligations of the U.S. government to the population, and this is also a huge amount of money. But the American establishment is not very worried about that. Why? The U.S. can print any number of dollars, allowing it to build up its debt almost without limit. Every new president criticizes the previous one for increasing the national debt by several trillion dollars, and almost immediately begins to do the same. The secret is that Americans have never had to pay their debts in full. Therein lies the biggest problem for the whole world. The U.S. actually exports inflation without restraint, but so far the dollar in the world market not only remains a reserve

currency, but is considered the most reliable means of payment.

Many economists, and I among them, believe that confidence in the dollar will fall, but let's face it: it won't happen tomorrow or even in the next few years. Dollar flows – not only mainstream, but "capillary" – have penetrated virtually every area of world trade, so their withdrawal will be painful. But the world is undergoing transformation, the balance of power is changing, and our place in it is becoming different. It is predicted that by 2030 China will overtake the U.S. in GDP in absolute terms, and now they are already equal in such a sly indicator as the purchasing power of the yuan and the dollar. Twenty years from now, according to experts, China's GDP will exceed that of the United States by 40%, with India coming in second.

And where is Russia's place in this configuration? By the same estimates, at the end of the top ten to the beginning of the second. But for that, from all points of view, it's important that we're not in a situation where we have to adapt to all the rest. I'm pretty sure we have all the right opportunities, but we haven't learned how to make the most of them yet. I believe this should be a priority in the coming struggle for our place in a future multipolar world.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Sergey Ivanovich. Academician Naumkin, please, you have the floor.

**V. V. NAUMKIN:** – I absolutely agree with all the colleagues who have spoken, but I would like to add a few drops of tar to this barrel of honey if possible.

Of course we need an ideology, but today, in my opinion, what we need in the first place is not so much a holistic ideology in the traditional sense, but something that can help fully consolidate, unite our people in opposition to the unprecedented pressure that is being exerted on the country. We see the significance of such symbols as, say, Peter the Great's birthday, which we celebrate today. Victory in the Great Patriotic War, the memory of it – these are also unconditional values that work to consolidate the society, including young people, which is especially important.

As for the special operation in Ukraine, I agree with Konstantin Zatulin. We must realize that this is not really a global war between Russia and the West. Any full-fledged war must inevitably degenerate into a nuclear war, but no one wants that – neither we nor our adversaries. Therefore, it is necessary to understand where the red lines are, which cannot be crossed, but can and should be used in one way or another.

It would be good to understand what's going on in the world in general. In my opinion, colleagues have pointed out quite fairly that a new world order is now taking shape. But it is also clear that the contradictions between the neoliberal model of globalization and the civilizational identity of peoples, including Russia, which defends its values, are growing and intensifying. All states that exist in the world today can be divided into two categories: traditional nation-states that are experiencing an acute crisis, and the so-called civilization states (China, India, Russia), which are increasingly developing on the basis of their civilizational component, their identity and their own position in the world. I think that in many ways this is the source of power to which we could appeal.

Globalization is really bursting at the seams today. The West wants to deprive us of benefits to which we already had very limited access. Freedom of movement of people and capital, dissemination of information, and cultural exchange have all been declarations rather than realities, given the protectionism that no state has ever abandoned. But now even the narrow window of opportunities that we had is closing. This is evidenced by incidents involving the detention of works of art that had to be returned to Russia after exhibitions abroad. But we are able not only to successfully oppose such a policy, but also to use it to our advantage.

And another important aspect of today's international politics. The West, which opposes us, is trying with all its might to turn the countries of the East, which sympathize with Russia, against us. They are threatened with secondary sanctions, new isolation, etc. For example, today the media reported that China is forced to impose restrictions on the activities of Huawei in Russia. Therefore, special tasks are assigned to Russian diplomacy. We are aware of the high qualifications of our diplomatic corps and we are confident that they will be able to unite as many states and nations as possible around Russia.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I give the floor to Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov.

**M. V. SHMAKOV:** – Just like Vitaly Vyacheslavovich, I intend to add two spoons of tar to our great barrel of honey. Russia is conducting a military special operation in Ukraine, but our compatriots live as if nothing is going on – there is full serenity everywhere. Of course, we have to discuss the current state of affairs and talk about prospects, but this is not enough. I believe that Russia should take more decisive action. In early June, Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov was forced to cancel an official visit to Serbia because the countries he was flying over did not allow his plane to pass. However, despite the unfriendly attitude towards us, we continue to supply energy resources to these countries, and Russia has not recalled its ambassadors from them or announced the severance of diplomatic relations. We have previously failed to respond appropriately to accusations against our athletes when, under false pretenses, they were not allowed to participate in the Olympics. Why? Some would argue that it is easier to destroy than to rebuild, but I do not agree with this argument. The tougher we act, the more respect we will get. Especially now, when war is being waged on all fronts – in the economy, politics, the information field, and only last of all, the military special operation in Ukraine.

Why does Estonia allow itself to display a hostile attitude toward Russia? In the Baltic States do not want to remember that in 1721 the Treaty of Nystad was concluded, according to which Russia received a large part of the territory on which they are located today, and, in addition, Peter I paid a large ransom for them. But Estonians and Latvians are well aware of this, as well as the fact that their land should become Russian. So the more firm we are, the easier it will be to talk to them.

What happens next? A leftist turn is brewing all over the world – in economics, politics, ideology. And this means that the role of the state will increase, monopolistic capitalism to be replaced by nationalization. Are we ready for this? What will we have to do and who will lead this pro-

cess? How to moderate the appetites of large corporations and oligarchs who are de facto selling out the country? Mariupol could have been taken without a fight in 2014, but our oligarchs did not let this happen, saying that they had a joint business with local entrepreneurs there and they would solve all the problems. They did not. What do we have in the end? Mariupol is taken, but with great losses.

Konstantin Zatulin says that there are various scenarios for the end of the special operation. One of them is to conclude an agreement, say, “Minsk-3,” fixing the borders along the lines of contact, and there will be a peaceful life. But such a “peace” would actually be a defeat for Russia and would lead to an even bloodier war in a year or two. This cannot be allowed, I declare as a citizen of the Russian Federation.

Let us recall the events of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, which resulted in a significant change – redrawing of the geographical map and introduction of new ways of managing the society. In the past century, the first shock to the world community was sinking of the Titanic, followed by World War I, which resulted in a collapse of several empires. World War II was an attempt to finish the “business” of the First and led to the consolidation of the Anglo-Saxon diaspora around the world.

At the very beginning of the new century there was a terrible terrorist attack – the destruction of the twin towers in New York, with thousands of casualties, yet again. After that, the world rallied against terrorism, but the intelligence services of all countries, including Russia, were effectively subordinated to Washington who coordinated these activities. This has not bypassed our country either.

Now the events in Ukraine have become a challenge to the world community and a pretext for unleashing hostile actions against Russia. Now a new plague awaits us – monkeypox (which, by the way, does not threaten Russia), and the press, including the Russian media, implant in the minds of people that this is a terrible new infection, so you should not kiss or even shake hands, because you can get sick. And so on. Day by day, new fakes emerge that are elevated into the category of ideology, and armed with such an ideology, it is very easy to rule the society. After all, how did they combat coronavirus? With total isolation – everyone stay indoors, don’t go outside. The same could be justified with monkey pox.

I repeat, the more firmly we behave, the more sharply we respond to insults and hostile actions, the more we will achieve. The Rubicon was crossed, and war broke out on all fronts. So we have to fight, or else we shouldn’t have gotten into it.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Mikhail Viktorovich. We will now hear from Irina Olegovna Abramova, Russia’s foremost expert on Africa.

**I. O. ABRAMOVA:** – I will speak from the point of view of an Africanist. In Russia people often say, “We are not Africa, we are not Zimbabwe.” But if you look deeper, you can find some similarities. After all, what was the strategy of the states that had built their prosperity not only on new technologies, but also, in large part, on the enormous amounts of resources that they exported from the colonies? They not only robbed these countries, but also corrupted their elites, tried to dilute the national identity, including

by reducing the use of national languages, etc. Today, all of this is being fully implemented with regard to Russia. So instead of looking arrogantly at Africa, we should learn from their experience. Now they are fighting the influence of the West as hard as they can and are trying to cooperate with us. Why? They understand very well what is going on in international politics. After the UN vote on sanctions against Russia over the events in Ukraine, I received many messages from my colleagues in Africa. Let me remind you that their votes divided almost equally – half voted for and half against. And all of them say, “Please understand, we are under tremendous pressure. But we are well aware that you are now in the same position as we are.”

And the second thing I would like to say is that in recent decades there has been a tremendous change in the way our mind perceives the world. Philosophers continue to debate the relationship between existence and consciousness, but information technology is making its own adjustments. Virtual reality affects everyone, in many ways shaping the ordinary, material reality. If an event is not on the Internet, it’s as if it doesn’t exist. But this situation cannot last long, because a man needs a roof, something to eat and somewhere to sleep. Therefore, the material component will eventually manifest itself as very important, if not dominant. In that sense, we are in the same boat with Africans. Both Russia and Africa have enormous resources, so in the future the world will largely take into account not only the interests of the West, China and India, but also those of Africa and Russia. This should be kept in mind at all times.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you. I give the floor to Academician Valery Aleksandrovich Chereshev.

**V. A. CHERESHNEV:** – Many colleagues mention SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, or COVID-19. Indeed, it has become a great problem for mankind. And monkeypox, while not as dangerous, can transform into something much worse as no one knows how its mutogenesis will go. Immunologists and virologists around the world are studying why these situations have become possible. In particular, the Russian Academy of Sciences concludes that the gravest ecological crisis is to be blamed. New infections arise as a result of processes occurring in the biosphere, which in recent decades has been subjected to the destructive effects of human activity. After all, the biosphere is the living things that inhabit the thin shell around the Earth: 18–20 kilometers above the surface of the planet and 9–11 kilometers down, that is into the depth. All in all, this is the space where life exists. And the three components of life are plants, animals, and microorganisms.

People cut down forests, huge fires are destroying enormous green areas – 28 million hectares annually! The fires also kill millions of animals. And the life of microorganisms is closely interconnected with the life of the rest of the biosphere. When the environment of a particular bacteria or virus disappears, it seeks out and finds a new host – a plant or an animal. Today Homo sapiens has become such a host, and microorganisms are increasingly difficult for us to resist. Biologists have proclaimed the 21st century the “age of viruses.” Yes, we live in a virus-saturated environment: one teaspoon of seawater has a million viruses in it.



**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Valery Aleksandrovich, is it possible that the coronavirus appeared in the laboratories that the Americans placed in Ukraine and Georgia?

**V. A. CHERESHNEV:** – During scientific expeditions which were organized to the Caucasus and China for the purpose of biological study of bats, hibernating individuals were studied and a virus completely corresponding to Omicron was isolated from their intestines. It is unlikely that these mice were infected with a laboratory-derived virus.

I recall that 40 years ago, in 1982, two Nobel laureates, Luc Montagnier and Françoise Barré-Sinoussi, who worked at the Pasteur Institute, discovered the human immunodeficiency virus. After that, there were rumors for several years that it was a biological weapon developed in secret laboratories. It was only when it was proven that the monkeys – the gray mangabey and chimpanzees – were the source of HIV that the bacterial weapon theory was abandoned.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Valery Aleksandrovich, thank you very much! Dear colleagues, I present to you the writer Dmitry Likhanov. His father, the famous writer and social activist Albert Likhanov, was an Honorary Doctor of the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Dmitry Albertovich, please!

**D. A. LIKHANOV:** – I want to support Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov and Konstantin Fedorovich Zatulyn who spoke about the People's Republic of China. Several years ago, China's president, Comrade Xi Jinping, said at one of the Party Congresses that by 2050, China would remain the world's only superpower. There will be no United States of America, no Russia – no one else. This means that Lenin's thesis of the victory of communism throughout the world will be confirmed. So the leftist turn has already happened. This needs to be said honestly to all of society.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Vladimir Konstantinovich Mamontov would like to express his opinion. We would love to hear it!

**V. K. MAMONTOV:** – Dear colleagues, I have two theses, both starting with an "i". The first one is ideology, the second one is IKEA.

So, ideology. Let me remind you that during the Great Patriotic War, with Stalin's permission, churches began to reopen. This was necessary in order to gain the support of the population, most of whom at that time continued to be believers. Stalin's policy on religion and churches is a good example of how ideology can and should consolidate society, rather than divide and impose one point of view.

Now about the Swedish furniture company. I thought long and hard about how to formulate our goals more precisely. Why do we need everything that is being done in Ukraine today? We're taking Mariupol, what for? Do we need IKEA to leave or to come back? This is a very important point. When we come to a consensus on IKEA, a lot will become clear. Personally, I recently restored a 1959 Moskvich with my own hands. It took two years of toil. Well, there's not a single imported nail in it. That's what we need to think about, first and foremost.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I would like to ask a question to Lieutenant General Petukhov. Veniamin Grigorievich, will we win in Ukraine?

**V. G. PETUKHOV:** – We just have to win!

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I give the floor to Academician Jean Terentyevich Toshchenko.

**Jh. T. TOSHCHENKO:** – I share the opinion that along with economics and politics, ideology – that is, a set of ideas that unite people – plays a huge role. I think you will agree that during the Great Patriotic War, in addition to the power of Soviet arms, it was the idea of unification that played a huge role in resisting the enemy. But what ideas are we talking about today? They have to be formulated by scientists and politicians, but in order to do that we have to know what people want, what they aspire to. This will be the basis of the ideology.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you. Dear colleagues, here in this room today is a man with the legendary surname of Gromyko, a hereditary specialist in international relations. His grandfather headed the Soviet Foreign Ministry for many decades, took an active part in the creation of the United Nations, and enjoyed the highest authority in international diplomatic circles. And now Aleksey Anatolyevich Gromyko will share his point of view. Please.

**Al. A. GROMYKO:** – Aleksandr Sergeyevich, thank you for your kind words about our family.

We are really in a situation now that is perhaps the most threatening since 1945, or at least since 1991, when we lost a large country where the core were the Russians who lived in the RSFSR. The uncertainty is off the charts, and the risks are very high. What scenarios may materialize in the next 2–3 years – no one knows, as many processes are transferred under manual control.

Today many speakers have said that market laws no longer work. Indeed, for many years they have been ineffective, and now we can forget about them altogether. The West has moved from targeted sanctions against Russia to "carpet bombing," and this will continue. What can be done? Russia is a great power in every sense: military, diplomatic, cultural. It is clear that we will use all components of this potential in the future. But we would like to be a great power in the new world, in the world of the twenty-first century, and our potential allows us to maintain this status.

Now I would like to return to the topic that has also been touched more than once today: our worldview, our idea of what place we will occupy on the geopolitical and value map of the world in 10–20 years. We remember that in the twentieth century, the United States grew on the concept of the "American Dream," which proved very successful. Millions of people moved there, capital flowed in, and the country benefited greatly from it.

There was also the "European dream." However, this concept became quite large-scale only in the beginning of the twenty-first century. Eurocentrism ended in 1945, but in 1957 the unification of Europe began, and Europeans were confident that after the collapse of the USSR, the European Union would lead and set the tone in the world on an equal

footing with the States. However, so far it has not succeeded, although the economy of the European Union is one of the three world leaders, along with the economies of the United States and China.

What about the Russian dream? There is a concept of the Russian world, which has been widely and actively promoted in the last 20 years. And it did in fact play a very important role in unifying the people as the ideological “tooling” of our actions in the 2010s. In the future, formation of ideals and values of people in Russia will be influenced by a variety of conditions. What happens around will become less important, although it is vital for us to have a strong position in the world. But the main things will happen inside the country. To what extent can we materialize the principles and ideals of social justice, the society of opportunity, meritocracy, social lifts, etc. are very important questions at all times, but now, after 30 years of hard and uneven development, they are becoming especially acute. Whatever external risks and challenges we face now are secondary factors. We must prove – not only to the world (this is secondary), but first and foremost to ourselves – that we can be successful. But in order to do that, we have to change and restructure a lot of things.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I invite Academician Robert Iskandrovich Nigmatulin to the microphone.

**R. I. NIGMATULIN:** – Dear colleagues, I agree with absolutely everything that has been said here, but I would like to draw attention to one detail. The situation is much more disturbing than most of us imagine, because economically we are opposing 950 million people in the world, while the population of Russia is about 145 million people. It is almost one billion people with their new technology, through which we have built our consumption. So the matter of concern is not so much exports as imports. In this regard, we have to solve the difficult task of import substitution. Why is it difficult? First, the qualifications of our government’s economic bloc leave much to be desired, and second (and worst of all), there are no qualified engineers left in our industry.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – So what can be done?

**R. I. NIGMATULIN:** – Educate. This is very serious. And speaking of the leftist turn, which, of course, happens in the world. As a mathematician, I will outline the theorem; it is especially important to do so in the presence of members of the State Duma. As long as a professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or teacher receives a salary 10 times less than that of a State Duma deputy, we won’t be able to do anything about import substitution. As long as the Ministry of Education and Science, which is responsible for the Academy of Sciences, does not have a single narrow specialist, but only lawyers, nothing will work either. Science and education should be led by experienced professors who have previously lectured and written textbooks. This is extremely serious. And the Russian Academy of Sciences and, in general, the management of fundamental science in our country was organized optimally. Best in the world. My American colleagues told me about it with envy. In 2013, the State Duma committed the grave sin of destroying this system. But we are waiting for you to reconsider those de-

isions, otherwise no scientific achievements in Russia will be possible.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Academician Makarov, you have the floor.

**V. L. MAKAROV:** – Dear colleagues, like many of you, I want to emphasize the term “ideology.” Why is this important? The world is divided by various criteria, but the main division is along ideological lines. However, our Constitution denies state ideology, although that is exactly what can unite us. Ideology is indispensable! And the leftist turn that is currently taking place needs to be fixed in some foundational documents...

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I invite Academician Lisitsyn-Svetlanov to speak. Andrey Gennadyevich, please.

**A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV:** – In all historical eras there have been wars, which in one way or another have always ended in peace. Even now, being in a state of war, we expect that sooner or later the conflict will be resolved and peace will come. But how would a peace agreement be made, on what terms? Who will negotiate and sign legally significant documents? We all know the joint photograph taken during the 1943 Tehran Conference – Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at the table. These leaders of states had their disagreements, but in those years they acted as allies, which enabled the eventual victory of Hitler’s Germany and the creation of a new model of the world order.

So the question is, who is going to make peace now? And what will be the basis for it, what circumstances will be taken into account as significant? After all, the legal principles that formed the foundation on which all international relations were built after World War II are hopelessly broken. Once the conflict is over, an agreement needs to be formulated, but who will draft it? That is a problem.

We have the United Nations, but we see that the specialized agencies of the UN are not performing their functions properly. In the end, if we do not take up this difficult task and work out the terms of the future peace on our own, we will find ourselves in the position of Winston Churchill, who, as he later confessed, felt like a small English donkey sitting between a huge bear with its legs crossed and an equally huge bison.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you very much. I address deputy Drapeko. Elena Grigorievna, Lieutenant General Petukhov said that Russia would win. And what will help Russia win, what will be the decisive condition?

**E. G. DRAPEKO:** – In its more than thousand-year history, Russia has spent only 300 years in peace. We were attacked from the east, south, and west. But we are genetically conditioned to win wars, it’s in our blood. In peacetime we do not think about it, but as soon as the need arises – we will all hold hands and show what we can do!

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – As a philosopher, I declare that ideology is the most important form of social consciousness. If the country has no ideology, it will not be able to develop normally and will eventually perish. In Rus-

sia, in my opinion, there is a misunderstanding of ideology as a post-Soviet disease syndrome. According to Article 13 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation, "no ideology may be established as a state or obligatory ideology." This article is understood to mean that there should be no ideology in our country, moreover, it is forbidden.

Tomorrow, one of the authors of this constitutional article, Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation and Honorary Doctor of the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences Gadis Abdullaevich Hajiyev, will speak at the Likhachov Conference. In particular, he explained that when they adopted this norm, they proceeded from completely different considerations: there is no single ideology that is obligatory for everyone. A political party must win elections because the people share its ideology. Ideology should be formulated and society should understand it.

As a result, the ideology of the omnipotence of money was adopted by the bureaucratic class and the elite. According to the principles of this ideology, money is the most important thing of all, and people should devote their lives to earning it. But this ideology does not mention the Motherland, friendship, and spiritual values.

In my view, the greatest danger for Russia today is its elite, which over the past 30 years has become so attached at heart to the West that it is willing to sacrifice the interests of the country so that Russia can once again become a donor. This elite annually exported about 100 billion from the country, and according to other data (from the oligarchs) – about a third of gross national product. They said with a chuckle, "Only a country as rich as Russia can afford it." None of this should come back.

I give the floor to Konstantin Fedorovich Zatulín.

**K. F. ZATULIN:** – I listen with interest to everything that is said in the discussion about ideology, and I think that in the Russian Constitution, not all the wordings are really successful, probably they shouldn't have put such an article in it. In the 1990s, this was done to finally say goodbye to the cursed past. Then it turned out that the past was not so cursed. Today this article of the Constitution looks odious.

If we try to construct ideology the way they did in the late 1990s, including those who proposed this article, nothing will work. Let me remind you that Russian President Boris Yeltsin instructed his assistant G. A. Satarov to find a national idea and a new ideology, but nothing came of it.

If our Constitution will say, "Russia is above all," it would be like "Deutschland über alles" or "Ukraine – above all." We must understand that if the people in power and in the field are not inspired by the idea of serving their Fatherland, then the time will be out of joint, and the same will happen that happened to those who today find themselves outside our country and speak about it.

I believe that it is necessary to continue discussions on this topic, including different stages of our country's history, in particular the multinational empire. During a meeting of the Valdai Discussion Club, I asked the president a question: "Why did we celebrate with grandeur the 800th anniversary of Alexander Nevsky's birth in 2021 and almost at the very last moment remembered the 300th anniversary of the Russian Empire?" In my opinion, it happened because it is uncomfortable to admit that Russia is an empire.

The country is currently celebrating the 350th anniversary of the first Emperor Peter the Great, and last year it was long pondered whether it was convenient to celebrate 300 years of the Russian Empire: what if we upset someone with the fact that we are an empire? In the framework of the Marxist-Leninist theory, it was customary to scold everything connected with the empire; here it is appropriate to recall the work of V. I. Lenin's "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism."

But the empire is first and foremost a multinational world, equality of all before the law. In the 1990s, the national question in our country was understood exclusively in the spirit of the CPSU Central Committee – that is, to protect the rights of small nationalities and indigenous peoples of the North. And by the 2000s, another – Russian – national question arose. I made an amendment to the Constitution of the Russian Federation about the Russian people as state-forming people, and it was incorporated into it in a slightly modified form. Finally, the Russian people appeared in the Constitution of the Russian Federation, which was not there before: "The state language of the Russian Federation on its entire territory is Russian as the language of the state-forming people who are part of the multinational union of equal peoples of the Russian Federation."

A month ago we received a clarification from the Presidential Administration on how to understand this thesis in connection with the arguments I have been having around the topic of compatriots. It said that the concept of "state-forming people" referred to language, but not to nationality. That is, there are no Russian people, but there are some people who speak Russian. There is no understanding in this matter that without the Russian people Russia cannot exist. And this must be realized and put into practice. A similar idea can be seen in Putin's article that Russians and Ukrainians are one people.

In today's discussion, many ideas were expressed. Is it possible to believe that in 1941, in the beginning of the war, Stalin had a problem with power, he was not recognized, and therefore he was forced to take extraordinary measures? In fact, by this time the fullness of Stalin's power was obvious. But the day after the outbreak of war the Supreme High Command General Headquarters was established, and a week later – the State Defense Committee. It is necessary to draw this line everywhere. And now it turns out that if the order is not formulated, then we do not fulfill it.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Konstantin Fedorovich. I give the floor to Andrey Konstantinovich Isaev.

**A. K. ISAEV:** – Dear colleagues, due to the fact that the word 'ideology' turned out to be provocative and provoked a discussion, I would like to make a comment. I agree with V. K. Mamontov that ideology should unite those who remain. Because those who have left (mentally and physically) are no longer connected to us.

I completely agree with the president that Russians and Ukrainians are one people, as K. F. Zatulín has already said. A war waged within one people is called a civil war. And here, in addition to the global dimension, there is another. In fact, we are faced with a civil war delayed by 25 years, being fought on the territory of the former Soviet Union. There can be no compromise in a civil war: the debate,

which is conducted with howitzers and mortars, is about one important issue: the choice of the nation's development path. And in this battle only one can win.

It just so happens that the choice of the path is associated with specific territories. Westerners are those who have accepted the role of a colony. They think we lost World War III and have to adjust to the winners. But there are also those who believe that we should claim the role of a great country in our own right.

If we talk about ideology, we do have a lot in common, the past above all. But we have to present an image of the future. We don't have enough willpower to organize everything, because we lack ideology. It defines the tasks and the personnel who must solve them, but all this must be done with the image of the future in mind.

Without ideology, and this is important in a global war, we will have no allies in the world. In the Soviet Union one could imagine those who supported it, let's say the communists of Southern Rhodesia were ideological supporters of the USSR. And how to find in Southern Rhodesia (now the territory of Zimbabwe) ideological supporters of the Russian world is a big question.

If we say that the image of our future is the American way without the United States, we are unlikely to be supported. If we offer an alternative image of the future, we will gain allies throughout the world, not only at the state level, but also at the human level.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Andrey Konstantinovich. Maria Vladimirovna Zakharova has the floor.

**M. V. ZAKHAROVA:** – Over the past few years I have often heard demands to revive ideology, inter alia, from people who are themselves the spokespersons for the ideology of entire spheres of our life: they act as their symbols and creators. This is rather strange, because people who have managed to reach fantastic heights (not only in appearance, but also in essence) lack something to portray the future. Even now, the speakers in this audience, who are our future because they laid it down, have asked to paint this picture.

Aleksandr Sergeyevich said that people are afraid to talk about ideology because of the post-Soviet syndrome. Why are they afraid of that? Not because the ideology was so strong that it claimed the world status and led nations and peoples in the absence of an information revolution (when there were no telephones or the Internet). This ideology united people all over the world. To date, no one, despite the information and communication capabilities, has been able to even come close to this level of ideological influence. It was the strongest ideology, not domestically, but globally. But what was the outcome? And yet at the center was a country with its role in the world, leading domestically and internationally.

The point is that the strongest ideology does not at all mean its collapse. But the destruction of ideology, tools, etc. has occurred. That is, we need an algorithm based on our geopolitics, resources, capabilities, culture and traditions, and most importantly – one that would work.

I listened attentively to the speeches of all the participants. Everyone is so insistent in saying that an ideology is needed, that I get the impression that only something that already exists can be defended in this way. I'm sure each

speaker has their own model, perhaps unifying and state-centric.

In the concept of national security and others all ideas are already described. But first, there is no engine developed that can run this mechanism, and second, people (from the elite to the regular population) are not taken into account. In my opinion, everything has already been invented, these ideas can be reanimated.

The ideology and the national idea are obvious: first, a person should want to live in his state; second, a person should want his children to live in that state. This is the kind of ideology our country should have. Everything else – the tools, the way in which this concept can be implemented (using force, suggestion, creating conditions, education) – is secondary.

It must be a state in which people (people in general and individuals in particular) will want to live and continue their lineage. Procreation is all about culture, education, and tradition. Without this, no superstructure ideology will succeed. If only for a while, but it will end the same way it did before. Everything else is packaging and methodology.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Maria Vladimirovna, your concept is clear, thank you. I give the floor to Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov.

**M. V. SHMAKOV:** – During the discussion we raised the issue of ideology not only to the academic level, but also to the peacemaking level. I would like to draw the attention of the audience to the ideology of a common man. I lived in Maryina Roscha, where a simple ideology was prevalent – the one who is stronger is right. As simple as that: if you are strong, then you will lead, you will be respected; if not, then you will obey everyone. Therefore, Russia as a state must be more firm and decisive in its actions, and then we will be respected.

A few words about public diplomacy. In 2014, Australia hosted the G20 meeting, which was also attended by Russian President Vladimir Putin. In the evening at the restaurant, the Australians, hearing unfamiliar speech, ordered first-rate beer for our table. After such a gift, we asked to bring them a bottle of expensive wine from us. We told them we were Russians and came to the summit as part of Putin's delegation. They thanked us and carefully took the bottle. Therefore, in my opinion, ideology is about communicating with ordinary people, about people's diplomacy.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I give the floor to Sergey Yuryevich Glazyev.

**S. Yu. GLAZYEV:** – We cannot have any other ideology than the ideology of social-conservative synthesis. The social component is social justice and the primacy of public interests over private ones. The whole system of governance must work like this, including the regulation of wages, property rights, distribution of incomes, taxes, etc. The second component, the conservative one, is the values of a family, of each person, their rights, something that was treated somewhat lopsidedly under Soviet socialism.

Here are examples of social-conservative synthesis ideology in different variants: Christian socialism, Islamic socialism, Confucian socialism, Mahatma Gandhi's socia-

lism. Today it is embodied in the new world economic order – a mixed economy where the socialist ideology is implemented not in words, but in practice. It permits private business, but encourages it in areas where there is an increase in public welfare. *Huawei* raised production from scratch and turned into a giant, but it does not allow private business to engage in speculation, to profit at the expense of society, and there are many such examples.

The ideology of social-conservative synthesis fits into our spiritual and moral culture, we do not need to invent anything. Especially since this ideology has come to dominate in the world: socialism acts as a general idea that determines the regulation of the market economy. Some atheists call this system market socialism, relying on instrumental things and the immutability of conservative values.

I want to support Konstantin Fedorovich in saying that we should not become complacent. The worst thing is to underestimate the enemy. After all, they spend 10 times more than we do on military needs, 100 times more on scientific research, and print 1000 times more money. And these are specific technologies: things that ride, shoot, etc.

Our opponent professes the ideology of posthumanism. What do they offer us today in their concepts and reasoning? The ideology of dehumanization, the deprivation of human beings of all signs of collectivity, turning the world into an electronic concentration camp to be ruled by the world government.

I have already said that the hybrid world war will end with the creation of a new world economic order with a mixed economy and socialist ideology, but there is no one hundred percent certainty. It is quite possible that unfriendly countries will be able to implement their plan: first, to wipe Russia off the map (and we should have no illusions about this), second, to destroy Iran, and third, to isolate China. I don't think they can implement that idea. It won't really work, because American superpowers don't work anymore. Even cautious Hindus are already trying to brush America aside. But this outcome is theoretically possible, essentially the end of human civilization, the transition to a posthumanoid state, where people will be controlled by artificial intelligence.

Therefore, the events in which we find ourselves force us to mobilize in every sense. The fate of all mankind largely depends on us.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I give the floor to Sergey Ivanovich Kislyak.

**S. I. KISLYAK:** – I listen with great interest and respect to all opinions regarding the need for an ideology, and I ask myself: are we capable of formulating a new ideology in the current circumstances? For Andrey Konstantinovich, this is not a problem, because he is a member of a party that has a clearly expressed and shared ideology that the party offers to the country. And other parties may have no such ideological platform.

Besides, I ask myself: if we decided to create an ideology for Russia, which one would we choose? Of the Communist Party? No. As a former member of the Communist Party, I would borrow a lot from it, but in the current climate, when young people are not trained to handle ideological tasks, it would cause a big problem that could start to rock the boat.

So for me now it is more important to try to formulate indisputable ideas on the basis of the Russian Constitution, which provides a good foundation, and in this sense I am ready to support Maria Vladimirovna. I would call that a national idea that should unite us. It can be supplemented as the state develops, acquiring consensual additions.

But I am wary of the formalized process of forming an ideology for the Russian Federation. This will cause the country to split. Ideology must emerge as a result of Russia's struggle for its place. We have a common basis for this: in the Constitution, in our history, and even in the programs of the parties represented in the State Duma.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I give the floor to Vitaly Vyacheslavovich Naumkin.

**V. V. NAUMKIN:** – Everything that has been said is true, but I would like to add one small thing. The society is tired of the use of the term "ideology," especially the younger generation. They are suspicious of everything that is imposed.

We need to solve the problem of our identity, which is at the heart of everything. Konstantin Fedorovich spoke correctly today about the imperial heritage as part of our identity – it must be developed. And what is being done today can serve as the basis for a new patriotism. The problem of identity is also important when we talk about the Russian world and the appeal of the Russian idea.

Around Russia is the Slavic world. But many Slavs today oppose our country. For example, the Bulgarians, whom we have been saving from enslavement for centuries, were against Russia in World War I, in World War II, and now, when there is a threat of World War III.

And our Chechen brethren, part of our multinational people, are showing themselves amazingly during the special operation in Ukraine. We owe them a lot. Their participation is an expression of ethnic solidarity.

We need to learn lessons from the recent years, not the distant past. Today we are talking about import substitution, that we have to do a lot of things ourselves. But who will be responsible for the fact that our entire industries are destroyed, in particular the aircraft industry? Where are the domestic aircraft developments that were killed at the root several years ago? We're going to be dealing with this aftermath for a long time to come.

I suggest that everyone should think about how to preserve the principle of justice, which should be at the core of ideology.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Dear colleagues, our discussion has come to a close. I will not undertake to summarize it, so I suggest that each of you does it on your own.

I think it is no coincidence that we devoted the second part of the discussion to ideology. In connection with this important issue, I will tell the story of how Soviet ideology was replaced by today's ideology. Several years ago, the patriarch invited the heads of federal television channels and asked why programs that cripple human souls were being produced. One of the TV bosses replied: "We have nothing to do with it. Television is just a mirror of life, we just show it." After that, one of them, K. Ernst, went to give a lecture at the Faculty of Television at Moscow State University, where he stated that Channel One created the ideology of

the new times. When the Soviet Union collapsed and a new life began, people did not know what to do and how to behave in the new conditions. The government had nothing to offer them. And then television began to show soap operas that offered new values and models of behavior in different cases of life to a mass audience.

I'm sorry that G. Satarov was unable to offer anything as a national idea at the time, unlike the TV channel scriptwriters. People watched soap operas and assimilated new models of life by copying them from the screen. "Who is a teacher in a school?" Ernst used to say. "Any schoolboy can ask, who are you, and who can confirm the truth of your postulates? We're free now." Irresponsibility is the hallmark of our freedom. And in a cultured society, freedom is always associated with responsibility. Ernst says, "Teachers can be insulted, but you can't insult the television, because we don't impose anything, we just entertain." By having fun, people learn new values of life.

The website of the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences has 1,332 works by Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov and approximately 180 works by professors of our University (150 of them are mine) devoted to the understanding of Likhachov's spiritual, moral, and scientific heritage. D. S. Likhachov, twice an Honorary Citizen of St. Petersburg, is the quintessence of the St. Petersburg intelligentsia. Few people know that Likhachov's grandfather, Mikhail Mikhailovich, was also an Honorary

Citizen of St. Petersburg in pre-revolutionary times. And then this title, like nobility, was inherited. This is the recognition of a kind of St. Petersburg benchmark.

Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov said that when the revolution happened, a lot of people went abroad as they couldn't accept it. It was hard for the Likhachovs, too, but they couldn't leave the country because they felt like they were at the bedside of their seriously ill mother: "I couldn't leave my homeland, just as I wouldn't leave my sick mother."

I agree with Maria Vladimirovna Zakharova that there are fundamental things that we either have or we are not a nation, not a country. I later encountered a similar metaphor in the work of Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, a man who greatly respected D. S. Likhachov. In particular, talking about his perception of our country in the 1990s, he noted: "Russia is a gravely ill mother at whose bedside I am. I cannot leave my homeland, abandon it, I will be with it to the end and share its fate." This was his inner conviction.

Many of us feel the same way. We could go away and get great jobs at Western universities, get big salaries. But we live in Russia. And no matter what happens, we will work for the country, for its prosperity and victory in the most difficult situations.

On this patriotic note, we conclude the first day of the 20th Likhachov Conference. Many thanks to the participants for an interesting discussion!